DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 279 575 SO 017 934

AUTHOR Segal, Morley; Fishel, Jeff
TITLE Political Science and Political Education: The Message of Management Training and Humanistic Psychology.
PUB DATE Aug 86
NOTE 40p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Political Science Association (Washington, DC, August 28-31, 1986).
PUB TYPE Reports - Descriptive (141) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Administration; *Discovery Learning; Educational Innovation; *Experimental Teaching; Higher Education; *Humanism; Instructional Innovation; *Political Science; *Teaching Methods

ABSTRACT

The teaching of politics and administration has much to gain from incorporating the experimental outlook of the field of Human Resources Development (HRD). Typically, instructors focus on the five goals in political science education (informational, analytical, synthetic, normative, and applied) separately, hoping that integration will occur "naturally" among brighter students. Since most instructors also emphasize cognitive understanding and abstract conceptualization, the "learning" that actually takes place is limited and fragmented. Using techniques of experiential education and discovery learning increases the probability that learning will be more integrated, meaningful, and exciting. C. Wright Mills, writing about the tasks of sociology, was eloquent in his conviction that the "sociological imagination" (political education in its broadest sense) could move from the personal to the collective, uniting large structures and individual biographies in its vision and application. The message of humanistic psychology and management training, where synthesized in the new field of HRD, suggests greater effort can be made in translating the sociological imagination into classroom reality. (Author/BZ)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED279575

POLITICAL SCIENCE AND POLITICAL EDUCATION: THE MESSAGE OF MANAGEMENT TRAINING AND HUMANISTIC PSYCHOLOGY

Morley Segal Jeff Fishel
American University

Prepared for delivery at the 1986 Annual Meeting of the American Political Science Association, The Washington Hilton, August 28-31, 1986. Copyright by the American Political Science Association.

SO017934

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Jeff Fishel

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

POLITICAL SCIENCE AND POLITICAL EDUCATION: THE MESSAGE OF MANAGEMENT TRAINING AND HUMANISTIC PSYCHOLOGY

In the past 25 years, an old social science task---management training and education for the public and private sectors---has spawned a variety of innovative approaches and created a new educational speciality. This new field, usually labeled Human Resources Development (HRD) or Organizational Development (OD), challenges conventional political science and public administration education in a number of important respects. We intend to analyze these challenges by:

(1) describing some of the most significant components of contemporary management education and training found in HRD, and linking these to the broader developmental and normative assumptions of humanistic psychology. Not all HRD education is "humanistic" and not all of humanistic psychology is appropriate for education, whether in management or political science.

(2) exploring and summarizing some basic principles of effective learning, principles that are shared across all disciplinary boundaries.

(3) discussing examples of the HRD approach, particularly experiential education, that we believe enhances undergraduate and graduate political science instruction. Specifically, this will include a discussion of (a) using time and space to structure the learning environment; (b) creating "psychological contracts"; (c) using classroom members as resources; and, (d) developing forms of discovery learning.

First, a brief consideration of the goals of political science education is essential, essential because the introduction of concepts and methods usually considered "outside" our discipline assumes they are relevant in meeting the traditional goals most political scientists carry into the classroom.

THE GOALS OF EDUCATION IN POLITICAL SCIENCE

A pessimistic colleague once described political science as an "archipelago in which every person is an island". Unquestionably, the discipline contains a broad and plural

collection of approaches, methods, and topical areas of focus. We believe that archipelago in the Greek sense, however, is closer to what exists in political science---a group of islands, connected by a common "ocean." Others have offered elaborate sketches of both the islands and the ocean and we will not duplicate those efforts here.[1]

Attempts at goal elaboration typically distinguish between substantive (developing "good" citizens, emphasizing a core curriculum or set of concepts and ideas to be mastered) and process. Substantive goals in political science virtually are impossible to gain wide-spread agreement on. Thus, we have opted for what might be called "quasi-process" goals in which the substantive is implied ("good" thinking, and its potential application in public affairs). Defining the goals of political science instruction in process terms, with a special concern for public affairs, has the advantage of placing the discipline within the broader near universal goals of all higher education in the U.S. Most political scientists teaching at the undergraduate level (our emphasis in the paper rather than graduate education) would agree, we contend, with the following semi-process goals:

(1) Informational. Whether the focus is on global, cross-national, national, or subnational political system(s) or processes, instructors seek to increase the accuracy and quality of information students have about the political world. The definition of what constitutes "political" is irrelevant; all courses in political science, from the most theoretical to the most applied, are concerned at some level with improving a student's information base.

(2) Analytical. Scholars interested in 19th century liberalism, 20th century voting behavior, leadership in the Department of Defense, or the relationship of tribe and power in pre-colonial Africa may disagree about what constitutes "good analysis" but all share a commitment to increasing their students' ability to disaggregate large problems, examine the components, and reintegrate material in a defensible fashion. We live in an age of "infoglut". Students who are saturated with information, unable to sort through the separate pieces in a coherent manner, are not "learning" political science in any

meaningful way.

(3) Synthetic. Teaching students to synthesize, we have found, is at once more difficult, more subtle, more elusive and yet everywhere valued in the discipline. It is the "reintegrative" part of analysis, the ability to link "parts and elements into wholes." The specific "whole" chosen, say Pluralism, Neomarxism, Positivism, Rational Choice, or any other "ism," is controversial, and irrelevant to our argument so long as the "whole" is compatible with the values of academic freedom.[2] Many colleagues report utter dismay at the inability of students to reach this level; all political scientists we know consider it indispensable.

(4) Normative. Even the most unreconstructed empiricist usually will concede that political values play a role "somewhere" in teaching. Precisely "where" is an old and honorable question. At a minimum, we believe, value clarification, helping students trace the normative consequences of private and public choices, and their impact in politics, is widely practiced in political science. It is a major concern for some educators, moving from clarification to efforts to consciously shape what students ought to value, and a secondary concern for others, where facts, empirical regularities, analytic schemes carry the dominant role. For us, the capacity to use empirical, analytic and normative approaches is what gives political science vitality. Inequalities of wealth, power and status in society, and their implications for political life, can be described, analyzed, and synthesized in a coherent theoretical framework that claims to be value-neutral but we are skeptical of the reality or utility of this claim. Not only do values affect the selection of problems and evidence, they also shape the meaning of theoretical concepts. A disciplined, conscious effort to be multi-valued, rather than value-neutral or value-exclusive is appropriate and necessary in teaching.

(5) Applied. Of what use are any of the above skills if students find them of little or no application in the worlds they confront outside and inside the university? Liberal arts education in the U.S. is probably more prone to be swamped by a vulgar

preoccupation with the practical than in other advanced industrial societies but some effort at applying what we teach in political science to actual practice is a goal that strikes us as obvious and incontestable.

HRD IN CONTEXT: HUMANISTIC PSYCHOLOGY AND MANAGEMENT TRAINING

Humanistic Psychology

Humanistic psychology is as old as Lao Tsu (600 BC) and as young as Carl Rogers.[3] It represents a sometimes bewildering diversity of approaches, ideas, people, fads, gimmicks, organizations and subspecialities. In contemporary American behavioral science, William James might properly be considered its founder although the term "humanistic psychology" did not emerge publicly until 1958 with the publication in England of John Cohen's book of the same title.

One of the authors once asked a new group of seniors in a personality and politics seminar (circa 1981) to identify what images they associated with "humanistic psychology." Among the responses:

> Hot tubs; encounter groups; permissiveness; do-your-own thing; California; touchie-feelie; unscientific; idealistic; impractical; concerned with people; out of reality; 1960s; hippies; therapy; what my parents have tried to make me do alot of (!).

Compare this with some of the items listed in the articles of association at the 1961 founding of the Association of Humanistic Psychology, where the founders (Shaffer, 1978, p. 2) described themselves as a "third force" in psychology, (between behaviorism and psychoanalysis) "concerned with topics having little place in existing theories and systems:"

> love; creativity; self; growth; organism; basic need-gratification; self-actualization; higher values; being; becoming; spontaneity; play; humor; affection; naturalness; warmth; ego-transcendence; objectivity; autonomy; responsibility . . . and related concepts.

Twenty-five years have passed since the founding of the AHP, and much of its basic orientation still remains misunderstood, or vulgarized and derided, as the student comments above suggest (good-naturedly and not without merit). Why? Partial responsibility rests with the exaggerated or misguided claims of certain of its exponents, who in deemphasizing the importance of the cognitive, the scientific and the utility of some social controls, have been used to justify many forms of hedonistic self-indulgence or simple foolishness, inside and outside the classroom.[4]

A more important explanation, we believe, resides in a natural yet corrosive social and psychological process: resistance to innovation, particularly innovation that challenges basic assumptions and values. A cynical mentality that ridicules aspects of humanistic psychology for some of its unconventional practices, predictable blunders and intellectual deficiencies, while insisting on the importance of achievements in the educational and other worlds that are more in accord with conventional definitions of success, misses some creative opportunities to expand and deepen the process of teaching and learning. Humanistic psychology itself has undergone a learning process since the birth of the AHP, and the creation of a subdivision within the American Psychological Association eight years later,[5] and it can now make a considerable contribution to the teaching of political science and public administration. What follows is a brief summary of its major tenents. More comprehensive treatments can be found elsewhere.[6]

Humanistic psychology (hereafter, HP) is hopeful about human nature, even among 19-year olds and political scientists. Burke and Freud are useful guides to part of us, but then so is the tradition that, in modern times, begins with Rousseau, runs through parts of Marx, John Stuart Mill and American transcendentalists like Whitman and Thoreau, and continues to Abraham Maslow and Carl Rogers.

Maslow's famous hierarchy of needs, contrasting "needs" with ephemeral "wants", is rooted in a belief that people are more than what economic or Freudian models would have us believe. They are capable of self-conscious, self-interested behavior that is not destructive or exploitative of other human beings or the earth's natural resources. His model is useful because it does not pose altruism in the classic sense as an alternative to self-interest; self-interest, understood in Maslow's terms, inevitably is other-regarding. Authentic self-development is not egocentric. Quite the contrary; it should lead to guilt-free giving, an enlarged sense of compassion for others, and socially-responsible activity in the world of public affairs (Maslow, 1984; 1971, 1954).

Human beings have lied, cheated, manipulated, stolen, raped, plundered, murdered -- sometimes on such massive scale the pain lasts for centuries -- that skepticism about what constitutes "human nature" is healthy, essential for survival. Humanist psychologists agree and point out that there is a difference between skepticism and disbelief, between what it takes to survive and what it takes to grow. If one acts, consciously or subconsciously, as if you will be cheated, manipulated, plundered or murdered, they suggest, you may help bring on precisely what you are seeking to avoid. The "Law of Personal Responsibility" is sometimes mistreated among HP exponents (not Maslow) because it verges on "blaming the victim" in its laudible effort to free human beings from a victim mentality. Survival and security needs, Maslow suggests, are absolutely essential, the fulfillment of which usually must be accomplished before human beings can seek and cope with more rewarding and positive needs. The fact that they "can" seek higher needs does not mean that they will. History is replete with examples of groups who were relatively well-off and secure economically, and who engaged in brutal and destructive behavior toward others. Maslow is closer to Martin Buber on this question than to Rogers. What constitutes human nature can never fully be known, he believed. Individuals simultaneously have the potential for good and evil. As he noted, however, besides having a Freudian basement, human beings have a lofty attic, and HP

emphasizes the potential in the attic.

Finally, the emphasis on "hopeful" rather than "optimistic" is intentional and important. President Reagan is a vintage optimist. Whatever the assets in his outlook, partially it is a mask of denial, a denial of the reality of pain and struggle that constitutes life for millions of people. Insofar as HP ignores evil and human deficiencies, advancing a more sophisticated mask ("all people need is unconditional positive regard"), it will fail in its expansive goals of human amelioration and growth. "Hope", on the other hand, is a necessary but not sufficient condition for change. Tolstoy put it eloquently: "you must believe in the possibility of change to change political institutions." This applies equally to the the larger questions with which he was concerned as it does to the more mundane, "what can I do with the 30 juniors sitting in this classroom?"

HP is concerned with human beings as "whole persons" and is anti-reductionist. Whatever specific roles people play or traits they might reflect---student, instructor, leader, voter, or angry, bored, involved, etc.---their behavior is part of a gestalt, a dynamically interrelated system, part of which is visible, part of which obscured, and, humanist psychologists believe, one basic motivation is aimed at unification or wholeness (Shaffer, p.12). Maslow and Rogers stressed that self-actualizing is a key because it is a process of becoming rather than an end-state. There are no self-actualized human beings. Many earlier psychologists (Jung, 1921; Allport, 1936; Goldstein, 1940) anticipated similar arguments, rejecting "trait" psychology because it misses the pattern and potential that is reflected in each person's unique core or combination. Shaffer (1978, p.13) makes the essential point: "To leave out the central organizer, core, of 'self' is to leave human beings fragmented . . . to make them into the alientated, center-less people they all too often, in today's impersonal world, seem to be." Further, a strategy of education that separates thinking-feeling, active-receptive, body-mind, conscious-unconscious, inner-outer, intuitive-factual, to name but a few dichotomies, fragments and underestimates the capacity for growth and learning. Individuals, given appropriate

environmental support, are capaple of more than what is predicted in models (eg., Kohlberg) that emphasize cognitive dimensions of learning. Conversely, humanist models that focus exclusively on affective or intuitive dimensions are similarly flawed and one-dimensional. However useful and necessary it is to simplify and abstract by classification and typology, it is dysfunctional to restrict educational assumptions to only one side of these or other dichotomies.

HP is phenomenological, not anti-scientific. The philosophical roots of HP reside in and around the legacy of the Husserl school(s) in which "reality" is not so much "objective" as it is a transaction between the individual's subjective consciousness and the "other." It rejects the notion that behavior is more important than the subjective meaning of behavior. In this sense, HP has more in common with approaches like the symbolic interactionist school in social theory than other offshoots of modern logical positivism (eg., Rational Choice or Skinnerian behaviorism). It is broadly consistent with many of the tenets of behavioralism, not behaviorism, in political science, although it is likely to be considerably more skeptical of quantitative analysis and formal models than the average behavioral political scientist. The causal model for HP approximates Kurt Lewin's Galilean field theory (Lewin, 1935) in which behavior is understood in the context of a field of dynamically changing forces. HP primarily aims at empathetic understanding, and secondarily at formal explanation. The older contrast between "science" and "humanist" is an illusion, based on a mechanical vision of the scientific method ("scientistm") that confuses methodological techniques with scientific inquiry. Of course, there are anti-scientific strains among some HP theorists and practitioners but there is nothing inherent in HP as an intellectual or applied enterprise that makes it less scientific than most of what passes for behavioral science in the 1980s.[7]

HP is concerned with expanding the range of human choice, responsibility and potential. Occasionally, when reading the work of someone like Will Schutz (1981), one might easily conclude that he/she has stumbled across the most reactionary, 19th century

conservative imaginable. That conclusion is false, though Schutz shares more with modern American libertarians than he does with either liberals, Burke conservatives, or old fashioned radicals. The concept of choice and individual responsibility in others (Rogers, Maslow) is less stark but consistent with Schutz: once people achieve survival needs, and can count on economic well-being with some degree of stability, every decision they make they choose, and pay the consequences or reap the rewards. People who believe they are "stuck" in only one approach to teaching, or in careers, political parties, consumption patterns, power struggles, potential nuclear castrophes, in fact, choose to remain there. That "choice" is frequently subconscious or unconscious, according to humanist psychologists, because it is compensation for fears about the negative consequences of failure (past or imagined future). Insofar as individuals are able to accept their past failures, most importantly including ones that are felt internally rather than manifested in the usual external sense, small or large, imagined as well as real, however rationalized, they can then function from a position of more creative choice. This includes paying the costs of the choices one makes, what Rollo May (1981) describes as expanding one's "essential" freedom while more fully comprehending and accepting one's "destiny" (psychological and social constraints on human behavior). The benefits, empowerment and the consequent expansion of one's potential, are predicted to be far greater when choice is acknowledged and understood rather than denied or rationalized.

With increasing acceptance of the inevitability of choice comes the gift (and curse) of responsibility. HP shares much of the outlook of post-World War II existentialism, adding to it a holistic framework: the commitment to the meaningfulness of choice involves more than a philosophical principle, rationally derived. It involves the emotional and cognitive, our unconscious and conscious processes, and requires, therefore, a willingness to explore all the parts of our personality that deny or evade choice and personal responsibility. The practical implications of this for teaching and learning are

spelled out later in the paper.

As this brief review suggests, HP is a bundle of ideas, assumptions and assertions, some of which would find ready agreement among management-oriented HRD specialists, while other parts would be irrelevant or disputed. HRD is a bridge to the world of work and training for the broader themes of humanistic psychology. It is constructed around, suited for the needs of HRD specialists and the structure of organizations. Those aspects of HP that do not fit--for example, exploring "all parts" of the personality--are tasks properly left to personal growth workshops and psychotherapy. Other dimensions, training managers to work with their colleagues and subordinates from a holistic viewpoint, have wide applicability in HRD. Similarly, we believe, in applying HRD and humanistic psychology in the political science or public administration classroom.

Management Training

Starting with the publication of Mary Parker Follet's Creative Experience in 1924, a major shift in management thought and practice began to take place. Prior to this time the emphasis in management had been on hierarchical control, formal structure and responsibility. This shift, which paralleled and adopted many of the concepts and assumptions of humanistic psychology, and was characterized as "The Behavioral Science Revolution," reached its peak in the late 1950's and middle 1960's (Rush, 1969; Luthans, 1977 pp. 24-52). The landmark contributors were:

Robert Blake and Jane S. Mouton, The Managerial Grid (1964)

Chris Arygis, Integrating The Individual and The Organization (1957)

Douglas McGregor, The Human Side of Enterprise (1960)

Rensis Lickert, New Patterns of Management (1952)

Frederick Herzberg, The Motivation to Work (1959)

While their works differed in scope and emphasis there also were some striking similarities. Some of these similarities, such as the emphasis on human potential and worker participation, drew clearly on humanistic psychology. Others, such as the emphasis on the small work group and need for satisfaction in work itself, drew more upon the behavioral research of the 1940's and 1950's.

The jury is still out as to how much influence these ideas actually had in the factories and offices of America. There is one place, however, in which their influence is unquestioned. That was on the practice of management training. If the content of the new management training drew on humanistic psychology and advocated broad participation and the development of human potential, then the pedagogy used to present these theories could hardly continue to be hierarchical and authoritarian. With the behavioral science revolution in management theory there came a parallel and thus for a more far reaching revolution in management training.

Starting in the late 1950's the new industry of management training emerged. Today management training is a major educational enterprise, at times rivaling traditional higher education in expenditures, scope and impact.

PRINCIPLES OF EFFECTIVE LEARNING

Modern principles of effective learning draw upon the application of humanistic psychology to management training. Surprisingly, nowhere is the parallel between management training and education in political science and public administration more apparent than in the early work of C. Wright Mills. Mills (1959, pp. 6-7) wrote, "The sociological imagination enables its possessor to understand the larger scene in terms of its meaning for the inner life . . . of individuals. It is the capacity to shift from one perspective to another--from the political to the psychological; from examination of a

single family to comparative assessments of national budgets . . . to range from the most impersonal and remote transformations to the most intimate feature of the self . . . and to see the relations between the two."

Mills was writing about the tasks of sociology, broadly considered, but we think his vision is a useful one for political education. Like the political scientist, the management trainer is concerned with understanding the impact of individual thoughts, feelings, and behavior on the larger entity, and examining how the structure, its norms and power relationships, affect the individual. The two educational tasks differ in their emphasis on cognitive learning. Traditional political science education emphasizes knowing and understanding how "the system" works. Management training does not ignore cognitive understanding but places such understanding in the service of action. Understanding the system is important so that one can influence how it operates and, in turn, better grasp how it influences one's behavior as a manager.

Management training draws on humanistic psychology to heighten inner and interpersonal awareness of feelings, identity and personal efficacy. It is one thing, for example, to read about the theory of political efficacy and speculate as to how this force influences voting behavior. It adds another dimension to realize how one's own sense of efficacy affects participation in the particular class in which you are sitting as a student. Conversely, to reformulate the question from the opposite causal direction is also important: how does class structure shape the student's sense of political efficacy? Management training grounds the personal and the collective in each person's experience, not to avoid generalizations about larger clusters (the usual approach of political science) but to give those generalizations direct, personal meaning.

The following principles of learning illustrate the connection between management training and humanistic psychology as they apply to education in political science.

Effective Learning Taps Into Existing Psychological Energy

Management trainers often start a session with a brief centering or awareness exercise asking each participant to state briefly how they are feeling at that moment, or utilizing a brief exercise (focused visualization) which evokes such a feeling. Often such exercises are particularly structured to bring forth potentially distracting or dysfunctional elements such as basic reservations about the subject matter, or a task at home or the office left undone.

By briefly discussing such feelings, the way is clear to proceed with the business at hand. During the session itself there are many formal and informal opportunities to again insure that current energy is focused on learning. Comments which help to do this include:

"I see a number of glazed eyes. Does this concept make sense."

"I'm not the only one who can suggest a break. If you are here physically but not mentally, I want you to say something."

"Lets have a quick go around the room stating in one word your current state of interest (or energy, as in high, medium, low)."

Such invitations may bring forth a discussion unrelated to the subject at hand but if the instructor is in fact one of the few people in the room focusing on the subject, then such a discussion is necessary.

Learning is a process not a product. It involves the continuous creation of new personal knowledge from a synthesis of new and existing ideas.

Management trainers seldom invoke the well known Lockean assumption of tabula rosa. They do not assume a fixed state of knowledge, made up of basic mental atoms, which can then be recombined into new thoughts. The focus in management training is

much more individual and personal. In considering participative management, a topic which bridges political science and management, management trainers usually use a written instrument or exercise to help participants identify their existing theory or practice of involving subordinates in decisions. Lord Keynes stated that "Practical men, who believe themselves to be exempt from any intellectual influences, are usually the slaves of some defunct econmist" (Keynes, 1936, p. 383).

To become aware and critically examine one's implicit theory is the beginning of learning. The next but by no means final step of learning is to develop a new, equally personal but now more coherent and explicit theory of management participation, and to compare that theory with the propositions and empirical data of others.

Learning Involves the Resolution of Conflicts Between Dialectically Opposed Modes of Adapting To The World.

Learning involves at least four different processes. We present them in the form of a circle to indicate that there is no order about which comes first but if any of the four is missing, the learning process is incomplete (Kolb, 1984, p. 66).

THE CIRCLE OF LEARNING

These four processes reflect the fact that learning involves the reconciliation of observation and action, concrete experience and abstract concepts.

A typical learning sequence in HRD involves:

- o An exercise or role play. (concrete experience)
- o A discussion of that experience. (reflective observation)
- o A discussion of concepts underlying the experience. (abstract conceptualization)
- o Action planning to put the above learning to use. (active experimentation)

Ironically, this mixture of activity and reflection is reminiscent of educational strategies designed for pre-college and adult populations. Only in graduate and undergraduate education is abstract conceptualization given a predominant, sometimes exclusive role. Learning theorists, who have worked with mid-career executives or children, are frequently appalled at the way college professors ignore basic steps in the process of maximizing "good thinking".

Learning Involves A Transaction Between Person and Environment.

Learning goes on inside a person but it also goes on outside as part of that individual's personal and physical environment. Management trainers acknowledge this by actively involving participants with each other and the rest of their environment in a wide variety of ~~ways~~, including:

- o written inventories involving values, attitudes, traits or behaviors which become meaningful as participants compare individual results and develop a group profile;
- o various patterns of homogeneous and heterogeneous groupings, e.g., biracial or multiracial; co-ed or gender-exclusive; partisan or bipartisan, etc.
- o exercises, role playing and projects involving mutual exploration and sharing of information in dyads, triads, or small groups.

The net result of such efforts is that knowledge becomes less abstract, more personal and applied, and learning becomes less passive and more active.

If we accept Mills' definition of political education as a process vital to linking one's self with larger processes, it is not difficult to see how effective learning must involve these principles.

EXPERIENTIAL EDUCATION AND POLITICAL SCIENCE: TAPPING UNUSED RESOURCES

The principle resource in most political science classes is the instructor. An effective instructor is presumed to be knowledgeable about the subject and able to communicate in an engaging and effective manner. Doctoral programs are designed to make such instructors knowledgeable. However, the second half, becoming an engaging and effective instructor in the classroom is not as easily acquired even though a few universities have established formal training programs (Fishel and Gillespie, 1974).

Some instructors are known as "effective," "spellbinding," "charasmatic," or "powerful in the classroom." Others are not. Many individuals have these qualities at one time but not at others, and find it hard to explain what it is that enables them to excite one class and not another. This puzzling link between cause (instructor presentation) and effect (student reaction) is to be expected when the principle learning resource is the excitement and charisma of the instructor. Not all political scientists are naturally dynamic teachers and even those who are rarely captivate on a regular and sustained basis.

The methods of experiential education described in this paper are not designed to make spellbinders out of ordinary lecturers. The intent and the effect is quite the opposite; to shift some of the responsibility of learning from instructor to student, or to the class as a whole, a shift that is essential from the viewpoint of developing self-responsibility along humanistic lines. This shift depends upon the instructor's ability to

tap into existing but underutilized resources in the class. We will focus upon five such resources: (1) space; (2) time; (3) commitment; (4) differences among students; (5) using the class as a polity.

A discussion of two techniques --- Action Research and Process Consultation --- also is included because they are widely used in management systems to study organizational dynamics as they occur, dynamics that are central to managing the classroom as a polity.

Space

It is easy to view space as given. Classrooms are assigned on the basis of the number of enrollees: 35 students will get a minimum of 35 chairs in rows all facing the front. Just as laws and regulations can provide the framework for political behavior, so the structural relationship of chairs in a classroom help control the frequency, pattern and quality of interaction. If the instructor wants all communication to go through him or her, arrange the chairs in theater fashion (all facing the front). If the instructor wants people to react to each other's comments, arrange the chairs in a large circle so that individuals see each other. If the instructor wants students to engage in a potentially lively discussion with frequent interaction, put them in groups of five.

To space one can add purpose. If the instructor wants people to experience the emergence of leadership in a group organize them in groups of 8-12. If the instructor wants to increase the liklihood of a lively discussion, then the strategy is to create groups which reflect a divergence of opinion (mixing people on the basis of policy, partisan, candidate preference, for example). Ask for a show of hands regarding opinions on a particular subject, and form groups composed of "for," "anti" and "indifferent". Another techniques is to form homongenous groupings; the "fors" developing a position which can then be discussed with that of an opposing group. If the instructor wants all of

the above, establish the norm that space is a variable that can be controlled. Chairs can be moved according to what is to be accomplished.

Space is a necessary but not a sufficient variable. The appropriate spatial structure does not guarantee the desired consequences but an inappropriate structure virtually precludes anything but an instructor-centered process.

Time

Of all of the resources in the classroom, time is least under the control of the instructor. It takes a certain amount of time simply to identify the resources of the people in the class. The number of exercises or experiences which can be built into the fifty minute lecture are limited. We prefer a two hour session because it is essential for many of the techniques suggested below. Management training workshops are usually conducted in day long sessions and this time period allows longer and more realistic simulations and exercises. There is no fixed or absolute time necessary for the experiential approach but what is necessary is a change in perspective. Instructors who want to share responsibility for learning with their students must move from regarding class periods as fixed and unchanging toward viewing time as a variable, the control of which is essential for differing results. We would not presume to underestimate the administrative problems in altering class schedules but this does not preclude making a start, seeking two-hour seminar-style assignments. As an educational variable, time is too important to depend solely on the registrar.

Commitment

Commitment is a major ingredient in the world of work. Without some internal desire to obligate oneself toward the accomplishment of a task most endeavors beyond

simple manual labor have little chance of success. How then does this need for commitment affect the task of learning in a political science class?

Many factors are beyond the reach of an individual instructor; interest or lack of it in the subject, previous experiences in the classroom, extra-curricular developments in the student's life are among the obvious. One factor, however, is in the hands of the instructor, and if properly handled this variable can offset or at least neutralize the negative impact of the rest. That factor is the student's actual experience in a specific class. The vehicle for dealing with these feelings and attitudes resulting from that experience has often been termed the "psychological contract" (Schein, 1980, p. 22). Whenever any of us enter a situation with mutual obligations and responsibilities, our willingness to commit is shaped by a series of assumptions and expectations. Often these are unspoken, and frequently all or part of these assumptions and expectations exist below our conscious awareness. Management trainers have found that it is very useful to bring these assumptions and expectations to the level of awareness and open discussion. This can be done in many ways. The following "expectation exercise" illustrates one such method.

On the first day of class or a training session the instructor says:

> "Before we get started, even before we go over the syllabus, I would like to spend a few minutes going over our expectations. Would you take out two sheets of paper. Don't put your names on these. On the first sheet I would like you to imagine that this class turned out to be the best course you have ever taken. It is absolutely perfect. Imagine what the class would be like in terms of:
>
> - Subject Covened
> - Relationship With Your Fellow Students
> - Relationship With The Instructor
>
> "When you are through we will tape these to the wall. I am going to do the same thing (give them approximately 5 minutes). Now I'd like you to do the same thing on a second sheet but this time imagine that it is the worst class you have ever taken. What would it be like in terms of the same three dimensions."

> The students and instructor write out their descriptions (expectations). The instructor then says "now I'd like you to tape your positive expectations on the front of the room and your negative expectations on the back. I'll do the same with mine. Then everyone in the class should walk around, look at both sets without talking. Then we will sit down and discuss them."

(Once seated)

> "O.K. what seems to be the common qualities on both the positive and negative side? How do they compare with mine? Where do we have similar expectations? Where are they different?"

The discussion which follows can bring forth the process of psychological contracting. Both instructor and students have articulated their expectations, and both have an opportunity to explain why they feel the way they do. It is <u>not</u> necessary to assume that the expectations of students and the instructor will be the same. It is necessary for both groups to hear and understand the expectations of the other. Both parties, instructors and students, should have a better understanding of expectations of the other at the end of the discussion. There is also an opportunity for some negotiating although the prime purpose <u>is disclosure rather than negotiation</u>. If the instructor is willing to negotiate, however, one example would be if the students give the professor negative reactions to some aspect of the course (readings or the lecture) that feedback will not be used against the student in evaluations. Discovering and articulating expectations in this fashion allows instructors and students a process for developing commitment.

<u>Differences Among Students</u>

It is often stated that students should learn from one another yet this rarely occurs. The basis for students acting as a resource for each other is <u>difference</u>; differences in origin, background, experience, reaction to the subject matter, and

classroom experience. For these differences to serve an educational purpose, students must feel free to state them. There should be a framework or process for understanding the differences in terms of goals for the course. Some differences are based on group origin as commonly reported in demographic statistics: race, gender, age, place of origin, social or economic class, status, work role, etc., and still other differences involve values or attitudes, party identification, belief in capital punishment, etc. Finally, some differences which are particularly helpful relate to differences in learning styles. All of these differences can be used as a basis for learning. This will not happen spontaneously.

The following is an exercise utilized in management training programs for legitimating visible or demographic differences. In this exercise, individuals have the opportunity to experience themselves as part of a number of important sub-groupings. The sub-groups themselves are thus legitimized within the class as a reference point for future discussion. The instructor states:

> "I'd like you to move the chairs to the side of the room and then come up here to the blackboard at the front. Now look around and make a mental note of the differences among the group you see which might be significant in our learning. I know it is a bit artificial but try to state the differences in terms of polarities: male - female, black - nonblacks, etc."

A list then emerges and can be written on the blackboard or a flipchart, similar to the following:

Male - ~~F~~female

Black - Nonblack

U.S. born - Foreign born

Over 25 - 24 and under

Full time students - Part time students

Working in a career job - Not working in a career job

Instructor: "Looking at that list I'd like you to indentify those differences which you believe might be particulary significant for us (Ex. Male - Female).

"O.K., taking the gender difference, could I ask the males to go to one side of the room, the females to the other. When you get there, break into subgroups of 4 to 6 and discuss what it means to be a person of your gender in the class" (note: one could also focus on the difference in terms of the subject of the course, U.S. political system, urban studies etc).

"Well you have had a few minutes in this grouping, what topics came up in your discussion? Do you have any questions or comments for the other group."

The procedure is followed for as many of the significant differences as time allows. Underlying this exercise is an important theory of growth, the theory of differentiation and integration. The theory states that organic growth at virtually any level, the individual, group, organization or system, involves:

a. a differentiation of parts. The finger in an embryo's hand emerges as distinct and separate; the females or any other part of a group emerge as a separate and distinct part.

b. integration to the whole. Once emerged, the activity of the finger is coordinated with the whole; the females in a group as females make a distinct contribution which fits into the activity of the whole group. (Werner, 1948)

According to the theory, the exercise does not create the differences. It simply allows the differences to emerge so that they can be more clearly integrated into the whole.

The same principle can be applied to other types of differences, sociological, attitudional and learning style. Because these differences are not as visible a different approach must be used for their identification.

Sociological, Value and Attitude Differences

Sociological differences have a long history as a basis for political behavior. To legitimate their use in the classroom, individuals must self-identify in terms of whatever category one is using. Management trainers have an easier time in this instance because

organization members usually have a clear idea of their place in the organization hierarchy. If individuals can not identify themselves in a particular category, it is up to the instructor to supply some standard or criteria for differentiation tailored to the particular situation. For example, American University has a large population of very well-off students as well as those from families with more modest incomes. The division around family income is significant here, as it would be in many universities.

Closely related to sociological differences are differences in ideology, values and attitudes. Here again students must be helped to differentiate themselves in a non-threatening manner. Written instruments and simple survey questions are particularly useful to accomplish this. There are also a number of value clarification exercises which allow individuals to identify subject related values. These generally take the form of an imaginary story in which the student fills in the details and these details reveal the student's values.

Differences in Learning Style

The most crucial difference among individuals in a learning situation, not surprisingly, are differences in learning style itself. Among academics, there is a general acceptance of the notion that individual students differ in their manner or style of learning. There is also general acceptance of the notion that classes differ one from the other in their reaction to various modes or styles of presentation. Unfortunately, despite the recognition of differences in learning style, there have been few tools or frameworks available to political scientists to help alter one's teaching style in response to the composition of the class.

Management trainers have faced the same problem but have been fortunate in having available a wide range of management and learning style instruments. "Style" in this context refers to a unique or different personal emphasis in accomplishing a task.

The idea of "personal style" gained general acceptance in the 1950's and early 1960's as McGregor (1961), Blake and Mouton (1964), identified differing styles of managing. Closely related to how one manages is how one learns. A natural corollary to most management style instruments has been a set of parallel categorizations for learning. The Kolb learning style inventory (Kolb, 1984), for example, grew out of management systems as a way to identify and understand different styles of learning. Kolb views learning as a continuous process involving four orientations (pp. 68-69):

1) An orientation toward concrete experience focuses on . . . dealing with immediate human situations in a personal way. It emphasizes feeling as opposed to thinking; a concern with the uniqueness and complexity of present reality as opposed to theories and generalizations; an intuitive, "artistic" approach, as opposed to the systematic, scientific approach to problems. People with concrete-experience orientation enjoy and are good at relating to others. They are often good intuitive decisionmakers and function well in unstructured situations. The person with this orientation values relating to people and being involved in real situations, and has an open-minded approach to life.

2) An orientation toward reflective observation focuses on understanding the meaning of ideas and situations by carefully observing and impartially describing them. It emphasizes understanding as opposed to practical application; a concern with what is true or how things happen as opposed to what will work; an emphasis on reflection as opposed to action. People with a reflective orientation enjoy intuiting the meaning of situations and ideas and are good at seeing their implications. They are good at looking at things from different perspectives and of appreciating different points of view. They like to rely on their own thoughts and feelings to form opinions. People with this orientation value patience, impartiality, and considered, thoughtful judgement.

3) An orientation toward abstract conceptualization focuses on using logic, ideas, and concepts. It emphasizes thinking as opposed to feeling; a concern with building general theories as opposed to intuitively understanding unique, specific areas; a scientific as opposed to an artistic approach to problems. A person with an abstract-conceptual orientation enjoys and is good at systematic planning, manipulation of abstract symbols, and quantitative analysis. People with this orientation value precision, the rigor and discipline of analyzing ideas, and the aesthetic quality of neat conceptual systems.

4) An orientation toward active experimentation focuses on actively influencing people and changing situations. It emphasizes practical applications as opposed to reflective understanding; a pragmatic concern with what works as opposed to what is absolute truth; an emphasis on doing as opposed to observing. People with an active-experimentation orientation enjoy and are good at getting things accomplished. They are willing to take some risk in order to achieve their objectives. They also value having an influence on the environment around them and like to see results.

While total learning involves all four orientations, individuals can and do differ in which mode they prefer to enter the learning cycle. Kolb then devised an instrument which measured individual preferences for initiating a learning experience with a particular style. The instrument has been widely used and validated. When a political scientist faces a class of 30 students, he or she can assume:

a. some people will learn best if they are first involved in a situation in an immediate and personal way (a simulation or role-play).

b. some people will learn best if they first can observe a number of situations and reflect upon them (case studies - data sets).

c. some people will learn best if they first can read or hear an explanation of a theory or set of principles (a lecture).

d. some people will learn best if they can first be involved in actively trying to influence or change something (an internship or field project).

Other data indicates that individuals with a preference for abstract conceptualization are likely to be attracted to university teaching (Kolb, 1984, pp. 123-131). It is no surprise, then, that the teaching of political science, as well as most other college disciplines, is geared toward individuals who prefer abstract conceptualization. The result of this self-selection should be obvious: much less attention is devoted to the other three preferred styles of learning.

How can knowledge of multiple learning styles be helpful to the political science instructor? We view its potential usefulness in three ways.

1. Awareness for the instructor. Most of us teach as we would like to be taught. Knowing this, instructors can take deliberate action to include other approaches in their presentation. If this proves impossible, instructors can at least be more sensitive to the reactions of the class when they are utilizing their own preferred learning style as the dominant method of teaching.

2. Awareness for students. Knowing their own learning style, students can

create opportunities to use it. (Example: turning a library research paper into a field report or visa versa). They also will have a more objective basis for making requests of the instructor that encourages them to act on their natural strengths.

3. A better understanding of the subject. Learning is related to the political process because politics, among other things, demands learning. Understanding one's own learning style and using a framework which explains the learning styles of others, can help students and instructors gain a greater understanding of such diverse phenomena as: (a) why Ronald Reagan is an effective communicator for many people; (b) why some freshman Congressman seem to learn the ropes so much sooner than others; (c) why international conflict-resolution is so much more difficult and delicate than a "blance of power" theory would predict. The application of this framework to a wide variety of political problems is feasible and stimulating.

The Class As a Polity

A final untapped resource are the thoughts and feelings generated by students within the class itself. Classrooms can be viewed as microcosms of the larger political system. Naturally there are differences in size, scope and legal impact between a classroom and a nation state. There are also similarities. Classrooms have formal leaders who have limited and specified powers (the instructor), a citizenry often apathetic but capable of becoming aroused (the students). Informal leaders emerge, decisions are made, subgroups and factions develop. People become alienated or enthusiastic. Classes are by no means nation states but the resources are there to examine some of the dynamics of the larger system.

Management trainers, drawing upon the practice of management itself, have identified and utilized two methods which allow workshop participants to study these dynamics as they occur. These two methods are Action Research and Process Consultation.

Action Research

The discovery of Action Research is usually attributed to the psychologist Kurt Lewin. In its basic form, Action Research involves gathering data from a group and then feeding that data back to the same group in its entirety so that the group can then discuss and react to it. It is not essential to have pretested unambiguous questions because the same individuals who filled out a questionnaire or were interviewed respond to the data.

Rather than avoiding subjectivity, Action Research utilizes it; a group or organization studies itself in order to change itself. Action Research can be used to study the political dynamics of a class as they occur.

Some examples follow:

1. A mid-course evaluation.

   Students can be asked two questions on a questionnaire, to be brainstormed in groups or to posted on the wall.

   a. What aides my learning in this class?

   b. What hinders my learning in this class?

If even some of the students trust the process -- in fact, even if many do not trust it -- the collective data will be quite provocative. This process will bring out the power dynamics of the class which usually exist slightly below the surface. The hardest part for the instructor who is new to such a process is to hear student reactions without feeling that he or she has to either change in response to student requests or defend the status quo.

2. Subject based Action Research.

Whatever the focus of the course, action research can be used systematically to bring out student thoughts, feelings, attitudes and values regarding the subject. Action Research is usually participative in management situations. Members of the work team participate in defining the questions, administering the questionnaire and managing the

feedback session. A similar process can take place in the classroom. Members of the class can manage the entire project from inception to feedback. Since Action Research differs in significant ways from traditional research it is important to bear in mind:

A. Questions should be simple and whenever possible, bear upon the actual experience of the respondent. Example: "One way the current tax system makes life difficult for me (or my parents)" is superior to "what's wrong with the current tax system."

B. Questions should be paired, positive and negative.

C. Feedback data should be on newsprint or poster paper so class members have to walk around to view it.

D. There should be a participative development of the agenda, meaning that once students have viewed the data, they should then discuss in what parts they wish to focus on in the class as a whole. They can also use a marker to check off those parts of the data on the poster they wish to discuss.

E. Those managing the process facilitate rather than direct. When questionable points occur they encourage individuals to ask other individuals what the data might mean rather than explaining it themselves.

F. The point is stressed that ownership of the data and its meaning resides with the group itself.

The class can be treated as a microcosm to provide a deeper view of the thoughts, feelings and nuances behind visible behavior when one uses the methodology of Action Research.

Process Consultation

In management training, process consultation refers to observing, analyzing and learning from the process by which a group operates as an organization. To the extent a class also has some of the characteristics of a political institution, process consultation can be a tool for learning about the dynamics of the political process. Process observation can come from the instructor or from students. Examples:

1. "Well we just had one of the more lively discussions of the semester. Let's look at what we did. There seemed to be some attempts for leadership. How did a person get to be a leader in this situation and what does that say about our class as a mini political system?"

2. "One pattern I've noticed in here is that whenever I (the instructor) get into a long conversation with someone, most of the rest of the class stares out the window and no one says anything. What does this say about feelings of political efficacy in this class?"

3. "I noticed that our discussion of South Africa yesterday followed an interesting pattern of participation. Did anyone else notice that? Today we're going to discuss Roe v. Wade. I would like two volunteers to observe our process and give us a report at the end of class."

It is not ordinary for a class to focus on its own behavior as a means of learning but conducting a class in this way can be a powerful learning process. The key to creating a safe atmosphere is objective description without attributing motives to the individual being observed. One example of the latter is boxed as follows:

INEFFECTIVE, THREATENING COMMENTS	EFFECTIVE, LESS THREATENING COMMENT
"Bob attempted to gain leadership by intimidating people with his loud voice."	"Bob interrupted Lucy before she was finished."

Process consultation is the most difficult of the methods described in this paper but it can also be the most rewarding.

DISCOVERY LEARNING

Discovery learning is a process in which individuals unearth knowledge or understanding as a result of their experience. The term discovery is appropriate because

individuals in such a process suddenly find themselves learning something that they had not purposely been looking for. Often ths new knowledge is something that they already "knew" in a fragmentary way. This is in contrast to transmitted learning which comes from instructors to student in the form of a lecture. While the term discovery learning may be unfamiliar to many political scientists the process (with the exception of creative visualization) is not.

The following methods have been used in political science for a long time. The contribution of humanistic psychology and management training is to provide a method for more focused and systematic discussion of the discovery process. Such a discussion also heightens individual awareness of the newly gained understanding.

Structured simulations and gaming. Dating back to the International simulation project and the early war and business "games" of the late 1950s and early 1960s (see Raser, 1969, for a good history and analytical treatment) simulation became a modest cottage industry among social scientists interested in experiential techniques. Our horse-back impression, undocumented, is that their popularity declined in the discipline by the mid-1970s because they required such elaborate staging, instructions, and direction, three items in short supply for most political scientists.

One solution to this problem is to simplify the structure and staging of the simulation but use process consultation as previously described as a means to deepen student's understanding of their experience. For example, an individual playing a member of Congress can discover what it was about his or her own personal negotiating style (in contrast to the individual's official role in the simulation) which gained or lost a strategic advantage.

SETUPS. (supplementary empirical teaching units in political science). These hands-on, quantitatively-oriented analytical packages, produced under guidance of the APSA, range in focus from presidential campaigns and voting behavior to the dynamics of political budgeting. They are an excellent vehicle for teaching both quantitative analysis

and scientific reasoning about political affairs, and many encourage students to become familiar with computer technology. How they are used is still an important question. To assume that students will respond to an essentially cognitive, research-style exercise, experiential to be sure, is to make the same mistake that is made in conventional lecture-discussion courses.

One way to link SETUPS to the student's personal world view is to utilize one of the previously mentioned learning style instruments. Individuals can then relate their preference to a way of analyzing or interpreting data to their own preferred style for learning.

Internships, field-work, cooperative education. The oldest and most popular form of discovery learning in political science, internships and their near-cousins are everywhere visible. Good surveys of the problems and possibilities of these strategies are available. (Hennessy, 1974; Frantzich, 1985; American University, Washington Semester Guidelines, 1986).

Process Consultation and other methods described in this paper can be used to help students utilize each other as resources in order to learn from their internship experience. Examples.

- Giving students learning or management style instruments as a framework for understanding their behavior while at work.
- Creatively forming subgroups so that students can compare and contrast their outside experiences in relevant homogenous groupings, i.e., male - female, black - non-black, etc.
- Using process consultation to help students understand how they reproduce their internship behavior in the seminar. An example would be a student who complains about being ignored on the job and in the seminar always waits until last to give an account of his or her own experience. It is important to note that individuals would not be singled out or embarrassed with such feedback but that it would be the focus of the general group process in the seminar.

Creative visualization or imaging. A simple yet potentially powerful technique for

enabling students to visualize political processes, and their own mental pictures of them, with their "inner eye". It enjoys extensive use in management seminars on creative risk-taking, innovation, conflict-resolution and in assisting individuals and groups project desired and/or feared outcomes about their futures.

Visualization is also used in management itself as part of the strategic planning process. It has become increasingly common for top management groups to go on off-site planning retreats and spend some of their time going through a visualization process. This is done in order for managers to understand their own internal image of what the company may look like five years in the future.

For students, visualization can be used as a quick and pleasurable (for most!) centering device, as mentioned above, effective in tapping existing psychological energy, or it can be employed to surface more complex, sometimes threatening psychological material that the instructor must be willing and skillful at helping them process. Macy (1984) has developed a series of visualization exercises around nuclear war whose goal is to break through individual denial and empower people in their capability to think and act creatively rather than staying mired in hopelessness, avoidance, or blame. Since visualization is extensively used in many therapeutic modalities, in addition to those mentioned above, political scientists interested in using it, where the emerging material might be quasi-therapeutic, should be skillful at coping with the results.

We do not mean to exaggerate the possible negative or emotionally destabilizing effects of some visualization exercises. Rather, as in the application of any technique like this, it is sensible to have trained consultants to help you, or to make sure that one is thoroughly trained oneself before introducing threatening images as part of a visualization exercise. Most educational visualization techniques with which we are familiar are designed to tap the positive, the affirmative, and to avoid deeper, therapuetic-style subsconscious images. Finally, since it is employed to reach the inner eye, naturally, instructors must overcome their embarrassment at asking students to

close their "outer eyes" before starting on a particular journey. It is important to announce and acknowledge that one respects the right of students not to participate, to open their eyes anytime they "feel it is going nowhere for them" (or for any other reason) and to expect a few will fall into a mild sleep. All instructional techniques, so far as we know, have been known to produce the latter effect but this is one of the few where the weary can take a brief and legitimate snooze.

CONCLUSION

The teaching of politics and administration has much to gain from incorporating the experiential outlook of HRD. In the begining of the paper, we identified five goals in political science education: informational; analytical; synthetic; normative; and applied.

Typically instructors focus on these goals separately, hoping that integration will occur "naturally" among brighter students. Since most instructors also emphasize cognitive understanding and abstract conceptualization, the "learning" that actually takes place is limited and fragmented. Using techniques of experiential education and discovery learning, we believe, increases the probability that learning will be more integrated, meaningful and exciting. For example, treating the class as a polity practically guarantees that analytical, normative and applied aspects of political life will be jointly considered. Of course classes are not replicas of nation states, so it is up to the instructor to help students distinguish the processes that are relevant and those that are not.

Mills was eloquent in his conviction that the "sociological imagination" (political education in its broadest sense) could move from the personal to the collective, uniting large structures and individual biographies in its vision and application. The "message" of humanistic psychology and management training, where synthesized in the new field of Human Resources Development, suggests we can do far better than we have in translating the sociological imagination into classroom reality.

NOTES

1 Varying themes and historical tensions in political science as a discipline are evident by reviewing: Finifter (1984); Dahl (1984); Greenstein and Polsby (1975); Graham and Carey (1972); Eulau and March (1969); Somit and Tanenhaus (1967).

2 As the reader knows, this is a complex issue. Totalitarians, of whatever ideology, are entitled to first amendment rights in the larger society, subject to the usual constraints on violent behavior, but they do not, in our estimation, have the right to teach in universities since their ideology contravenes one of the most basic principles of academic freedom. Applying this rule in practice assumes that universities have well developed procedural safeguards ("due process") as protection against witch-hunts of the sort manifested in the 1940s and 1950s.

3 Rogers is a very young 83. His most recent book (Rogers, 1980) is as fresh and original as some of his earl[illegible], now classic writing (e.g., Rogers, 1961).

4 A critical but still supportive overview of humanistic education in the 1960s and 1970s will be found in Nash (1980) and Smith (1974). Quasi-popular indictments (Lasch, 1981) contain a few persuasive arguments but suffer from many basic misconceptions. The most comprehensive and useful critique of humanistic assumptions in personality theory is Becker (1983).

5 Division 32, the Division of Humanistic Psychology, American Psychological Association, created in 1970.

6 Two good sources are Shaffer (1978) and Tageson (1984). Applications in political life have begun to appear with increasing regularity: Greening (1985); Stein (1985); Milbrath (1984); Anderson (1983); Woolpert (1982); Gurtov (1979); Anderson (1973); Knutson (1972). Humanistic psychology - as - political theory has been criticized by various scholars. See Buss (1979) for a fine example. Of course, we are referring here to humanistic psychology, not humanism generally, or humanistic politics, both of which have ancient origins and shifting historical themes. A modern humanistic approach in political science, while unfortunately lacking any connection to humanistic psychology, is the report of the APSA's National Endowment for the Humanities liaison committee (Bluhm, et al., 1985).

7 For example, antagonism toward any form of empirical social science is evident in some of the writing of the work of Fritz Perls (1967) and parts of the later writing of Maslow (1971).

REFERENCES

American University, The Washington Semester Program. (1986). "Guidelines for an Effective Internship."

Anderson, Walter. ed. 1983. Rethinking Liberalism. New York: Avon.

_____. 1974. Politics and the New Humanism. Pacific Palisades: Goodyear.

Arygis, Chris. 1957. Integrating the Individual and the Organization. New York. Harpers.

Becker, Ernest. 1983. The Denial of Death. New York: Free Press.

Blake, Robert and Mouton, Jane. 1964. The Managerial Grid. Houston. Gulf Publishing Company.

Bluhm, William T. et al. 1985. "Political Science and the Humanities; A Report of the American Political Science Association," P.S. 18 (Spring): pp. 247-259.

Buss, Allan R. 1979. "Humanistic Psychology as Liberal Ideology," Journal of Humanistic Psychology, 19 (Summer), pp. 43-55. Reprinted in Greening, American Politics.

Dahl, Robert A. 1984. Modern Political Analysis. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall. Fourth Edition.

Eulau, Heinz and James March. eds. 1969. Political Science: the Behavioral and Social Sciences Survey. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall.

Finifter, Ada. ed. 1984. Political Science: The State of the Discipline. Washington, D.C.: American Political Science Association.

Fishel, Jeff and Judith Gillespie. 1974. "Graduate Education and the Development of Teaching Skills in Political Science." Paper delivered at the 1974 Annual Meeting of the American Political Science Association.

Follett, Mary Parker. Creative Experience. 1924, New York. Longmans Green.

Frantzich, Stephen. 1985. Storming Washington - An Intern's Guide to National Government. Washington, D.C.: American Political Science Association.

Graham, George J. and George W. Carey, eds. 1972. The Post-Behavioral Era:

Perspectives on Political Science. New York: David McKay Company.

Greening, Tom. ed. 1985. American Politics and Humanistic Psychology.

Greenstein, Fred I. and Nelson Polsby, eds. 1975. Handbook of Political Science. 8 vols. Addison-Wesley.

Gurtov, Melvin. 1979. Making Changes: The Politics of Self-Liberation. Riverside, California: Harvest Moon Books.

Herzberg, Frederick. 1959. The Motivation To Work. New York. Wiley.

Keynes, John Maynard. 1936. The General Theory of Employment, Interest and Money. New York. Harcourt Brace.

Knutson, Jeane. 1972. The Human Basis of the Polity. Chicago: Aldine.

Kolb, David A. 1984. Experiential Learning. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall.

_____. 1976. The Learning Style Inventory: Technical Manual. Boston: McBer and Company.

_____. 1981. "Experiential Style Learning Theory and the Learning Style Inventory: A Reply to Freedman and Stumpf," Academy of Management Review. (June).

Lasch, Christopher. 1981. The Culture of Narcissism.

Lewin, Kurt. 1935. "The Conflict Between Aristotelian and Gallilean Modes of Thought in Contemporary Psychology" in Lewin, Kurt. A Dynamic Theory of Personality. 1936. New York. McGraw Hill.

Lickert, Rensis. 1962. New Patterns of Management. New York, McGraw Hill.

Luthans, Fred. 1977. Organizational Berhavior. New York. McGraw Hill.

Maslow, Abraham. 1971. The Farther Reaches of Human Nature. New York: Viking.

_____ 1954. Motivation and Personality. New York: Harper (2nd edition, 1970).

_____. 1968. Toward a Psychology of Being. New York: Litton Educational Publishers.

May, Rollo. 1981. Freedom and Destiny. New York: Delta.

McGregor, Douglas. 1960. The Human Side of Enterprise. New York: McGraw Hill.

Milbrath, Lester. 1984. Environmentalists: Vanguard of a New Society. Albany: State University of New York Press.

Mills, C. Wright. 1959. The Sociological Imagination. New York: Oxford University Press.

Nash, Paul. 1980. "Humanism and Humanistic Education in the 1980s: The Lessons of Two Decades," Journal of Education. 162 (Summer), pp. 5-17.

Perls, Fritz. 1967. Gestalt Therapy Verbatim.

Raser, John. 1969. Simulation and Society. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Rogers, Carl. 1980. A Way of Being. Boston: Houghton-Mifflin.

_____. 1961. On Becoming a Person. Boston: Houghton-Mifflin.

Rush, Harold. 1969. Behavioral Science: Concepts and Management Application. New York. The National Industrial Conference Board.

Schein, Edgar H. 1980. Organizational Psychology. 3rd edition. Englewood Cliffs. Prentice-Hall.

Schutz, Will. 1979. Profound Simplicity. New York: Bantam.

Shaffer, John B. P. 1978. Humanistic Psychology. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall.

Smith, M. Brewster. 1974. Humanizing Social-Psychology. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Somit, Albert and Joseph Tanenhaus. 1967. The Development of Political Science. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Stein, Arthur. (1985). Seeds of the Seventies. Boston: University of New England Press.

Tageson, C. William. 1984. Humanistic Psychology: A Synthesis. Homewood, Illinois: Dorsey Press.

Werner, Heinz. 1948. Comparative Psychology of Mental Development. New York. International University Press

Woolpert, Stephen. 1982. "A Comparison of Rational Choice and Self-Actualization Theories of Politics," Journal of Humanistic Psychology. 22 (Summer) pp. 55-67. Reprinted in Greening, American Politics and Humanistic Psychology.

Zauderer, Donald. 1973. "Urban Internships in Higher Eduation," ERIC/Higher Education Report 9. Washington, D.C. American Association of Higher Education.